

If a person passes through this state while going to another state in obedience to a summons to attend and testify in that state or while returning therefrom, he shall not while so passing through this state be subject to arrest or the service of process, civil or criminal, in connection with matters which arose before his entrance into this state under the summons.

1937, ch. 124, sec. 560D.

660. (Uniformity of Interpretation.) This sub-title shall be so interpreted and construed as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law of the states which enact it.

1937, ch. 124, sec. 560E.

661. (Short Title.) This sub-title may be cited as "Uniform Act to Secure the Attendance of Witnesses from without a State in Criminal Proceedings".

1937, ch. 124, sec. 3.

662. If any provision of this sub-title or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the sub-title which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this sub-title are declared to be severable.¹

Indictments—Selling Liquor.

An. Code, 1924, sec. 561. 1912, sec. 504. 1904, sec. 446. 1890, ch. 429, sec. 288A.
1890, ch. 492, sec. 288A.

663. In any indictment for the unlawful sale or disposition of spirituous or fermented liquors or lager beer, it shall not be necessary to specify the particular variety, provided the indictment sets forth an unlawful sale or disposition of intoxicating liquor, but the defendant, on application to the State's attorney before trial, may obtain a statement of the particular variety of liquor expected to be proved.

This section referred to in sustaining indictment for violation of local liquor law for Washington County. Evidence. *Weller v. State*, 150 Md. 281.

The right to demand a bill of particulars in a prosecution for unlawful sale of liquor does not cure the duplicity in the indictment, which charges defendant with some acts disjunctively, any one of which constituted a crime, and with other acts which may or may not have constituted crimes. *Thomas v. State*, 173 Md. 676.

Indictment for sale of "distilled alcoholic liquor," in violation of local law of Harford County, held sufficient under this section. *Hill v. State*, 174 Md. 149.

Indictment under act of 1890, ch. 568, prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors, except cider by maker thereof not to be drunk on the premises in Annapolis, held valid though it did not name the kind of liquor traverser is accused of selling, nor negative cider. See notes to sec. 620. *Howes v. State*, 141 Md. 547.

This section is constitutional and valid. *Keifer v. State*, 87 Md. 564.

This section referred to in sustaining indictment for violation of a local law for Harford County relative to sale of liquor. *Curry v. State*, 117 Md. 590.

See sec. 560, *et seq.*

Indictments—Violation of City or Town Ordinances.

An. Code, 1924, sec. 562. 1912, sec. 505. 1904, sec. 447. 1900, ch. 131, sec. 291C.
1929, ch. 245.

664. In every indictment or warrant for the violation of any ordinance of any incorporated city or town of this State or of the Board of County Commissioners of any county of this State or of the Special Taxing Area

¹ Sec. 2, ch. 124, acts of 1937, repealed all laws inconsistent therewith.